DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 281 RC 015 850

AUTHOR Saenz, Rogelio
TITLE Chicana Fertility: A Look Within.
PUB DATE Aug 85
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rural Sociological Association (48th, Blacksburg, VA, August 21-24, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Age Differences; *Birth Rate; Demography; Educational Attainment; Ethnic Distribution; *Females; Immigrants; Marital Status; *Mexican Americans; *Mexicans; Predictor Variables; Social Science Research; *Socioeconomic Influences; Statistical Bias
IDENTIFIERS Aggregation (Data); Chicanas; Disaggregation (Data)

ABSTRACT

Fertility research among four groups of Chicanas showed intragroup differences in fertility rates and in relationships between fertility and independent socioeconomic variables. A literature review suggested that research on minority group fertility failed to recognize intragroup variations. Data from the 1980 Public-Use Microdata Sample yielded a sample of 13,288 ever-married women of Mexican descent aged 15 to 44. The women were divided into four groups--Mexican women immigrating to the United States since 1970; Mexican women immigrating before 1970; Chicanas born in one of five southwestern states; and Chicanas born outside the southwest. Few differences were found to exist between the groups; nevertheless, the following trends were seen: (1) Mexican women immigrating since 1970 and women born in states outside the Southwest were found to have fewer children; and (2) pre-1970 immigrants and women born in a southwestern state had more children. Age, age at first marriage, and education were the strongest predictors of fertility for all groups. Influence on fertility patterns of marital disruption, labor force participation, family income, and proportion of family income earned by women varied between the groups. Implications for researchers using Spanish-origin statistics to represent Mexican American population are discussed and benefits of disaggregation techniques are presented. Tables provide summary statistics of variables and multiple classification analyses of relationships between variables and fertility. A three-page reference list and several tables are included. (LFL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED271281

RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Rogelio Saenz
Iowa State University
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Ames, IA 50011

Chicana Fertility: A Look Within

Paper Presented at the 1985 meeting of the Rural Sociological Society. Blacksburg (VA).

August 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Rogelio Saenz

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RC 015850

ABSTRACT

High-fertility minority groups have long attracted the attention of demographers. Chicanos have been characterized as one of these groups. Minority-group fertility research has generally focused on fertility levels between minority and majority groups. Less attention has centered on fertility within minority groups. Using data from the 1980 Public-Use Microdata Sample, fertility within the Chicano group is examined. The sample consists of 13,288 ever-married Mexican-origin women between the ages of 15 and 44. The women were divided into four groups: Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. since 1970; Mexican-born women coming to the U.S. before 1970; native-born Chicanas born in one of five soutwestern states; native-born Chicanas born outside the soutwest. The results show that after controlling for demographic, marital history, and socioeconomic variables, few differences in fertility exist between the four groups. Age, age at first marriage, and education are the strongest predictors of fertility among the four groups. The groups, however, differ with regard to the relationships between fertility and four other marital history and socioeconomic variables. Implications for researchers studying one single Chicano population conclude the paper.

High-fertility minority groups have long attracted the attention of demographers. High fertility among Chicanos has been evident at least since the mid-nineteenth century (Bradshaw and Bean, 1972). Two approaches have been used in explaining different fertility levels among minority and majority groups. The first, the assimilationist approach, posits that fertility differences can be attributed solely to socioeconomic differences. The assimilationist perspective argues that once the minority group achieves similar socioeconomic characteristics as those of the majority, fertility levels will be similar. The second approach, the minority-group status hypothesis, asserts that minority group status exerts an influence on fertility, independently of socioeconomic characteristics.

But while demographers have been interested in comparing the fertility of Chicanos and other minority groups to that of whites, little research has examined the fertility behavior within the Chicano population. Chicanos are diverse; for instance, different subgroups within this population have been demonstrated to differ on socioeconomic factors (Burma, 1970; Teller et al., 1977; Garcia and Maldonado, 1982). Research that has examined intragroup fertility has been concerned with generational differences. Less research, however, has examined regional differences in fertility among members of minority groups. Hence, this paper will examine the fertility of four Chicana subgroups: Mexican-born Chicanas who immigrated to the U.S. in 1970 or later, Mexican-born Chicanas who immigrated to the U.S. before 1970, Chicanas born in one of five U.S. southwestern states, and native-born Chicanas born in a nonsouthwestern states.

Literature Review

Until recently, the assimilation perspective was used to explain fertility differences between minority groups and U.S. whites (Jiobu and Marshall, 1977). This approach argues that differences in fertility levels can be attributed to differences in various social, demographic, and economic characteristics between the groups (Lee and Lee, 1959; Gordon, 1964; Petersen, 1969). Once such differences between the groups have disappeared, fertility among minority and nonminority groups should become similar (Lee and Lee, 1959).

Goldscheider and Uhlenberg (1969), however, challenged the prevailing perspective and developed the minority-group status hypothesis. This perspective asserts that minority group status affects fertility independently of social, demographic, and economic characteristics (Goldscheider and Uhlenberg, 1969). Goldscheider and Uhlenberg argued that, in the absence of a minority group holding pro-natalist norms and the presence of a desire for acculturation and socioeconomic mobility, the disadvantages and insecurities associated with minority group status tend to inhibit fertility. Indeed, Goldscheider and Uhlenberg (1969) discovered that highly educated blacks and Jews had lower fertility levels than did whites or non-Jews, after controlling for such variables as place of residence and education. Similarly, Roberts and Lee (1974) found that among persons with Spanish surnames, Anglos, and blacks in five southwestern states, ethnicity exerted an influence on fertility, independently of income, occupation, residence, and education. In addition, Grebler et al. (1970) revealed

that Mexican Americans had higher fertility levels than did Anglos in every income category examined. Furthermore, other studies (e.g., Kennedy, 1973; Bean and Wood, 1974; Roberts and Lee, 1974; Ritchey, 1975) have tended to find support for the minority group status hypothesis.

While the majority of research on minority group fertility has followed these two approaches and hence has focused on between-group comparisons, others have called for the examination of the relationship between socioeconomic status and fertility within minority and majority groups. Browning (1974) asserted that between-group research has resulted in the neglect of fertility variations within minority and majority groups. Illustratively, Bean and Wood (1974) examined within-group differences among once-married southwestern Anglo, Mexican American, and black women between 40 and 49 years of age with regard to the relationship between real and actual income and fertility. They found a positive relationship between both types of income and fertility among Anglos, a positive and a negative relationship between relative and actual income, respectively, and fertility among Mexican Americans, and a negative relationship between both types of incomes and fertility among blacks.

A number of demographic and marital history variables have been shown to be related to women's fertility behavior. For instance, it is well-known that age is an important variable in any demographic study (Petersen, 1969). Of course, among women of childbearing age, those who are older are more likely to have more children since they have been "at risk" of childbearing longer than younger women. In addition, age at first marriage has been found to be negatively related to fertility (Bogue, 1969; Bumpass, 1969; Cho et al., 1970; Jiobu and Marshall, 1977;

Rindfuss and Sweet, 1977; Lopez and Sabagh, 1978; Johnson, 1979; Johnson and Nishida, 1980). Because of the presence of a husband for a longer period, women that marry at a younger age have more of a chance of conceiving than those that marry at an older age (Bradshaw and Bean, 1972). Similarly, it has been demonstrated that marital disruption has an effect on fertility (Bogue, 1969; Sweet and Cohen, 1974; Gurak, 1978; Johnson, 1979). Indeed, women who have encountered a separation from their husbands for any of several reasons (e.g., separation, divorce, death) tend to have lower fertility levels than those who never have been separated from their husbands (Gurak, 1978). Moreover, the place where one lives also has an influence on fertility levels. For instance, it has been observed that rural women generally have more children than do their urban counterparts (Rindfuss and Sweet, 1977). And, regional differences in fertility have also been discovered. Researchers have differed in the manner in which they have made regional comparisons; this difference has centered on the use of either place of residence (Gastil, 1971; Loftin and Hill, 1974) or place of birth (Ram, 1976). Ram (1976) revealed that while being born in the South tended to increase fertility among blacks, this level was not as high as for those born in the North Central region, after controlling for other variables.

Socioeconomic attributes have also been found to be related to fertility. For example, numerous researchers have found that women's educational level is negatively related to fertility (Bradshaw and Bean, 1972; Uhlenberg, 1973; Roberts and Lee, 1974; Ritchey, 1975; Kritz and Gurak, 1976; Gurak, 1978; Johnson, 1979; Bean and Swicegood, 1982). Lee and Roberts (1981) discovered that among Spanish-descent women living in five southwestern states, education had a significantly negative effect

on fertility. Indeed, highly educated Mexican-American women have been shown to have lower fertility than their Anglo counterparts (Bradshaw and Bean, 1972; Uhlenberg, 1973; Roberts and Lee, 1974; Gurak, 1978). Income is another socioeconomic variable that has been found related to fertility. Four measures of this concept have been used: woman's income (Kritz and Gurak, 1976), woman's income as proportion of total family income (Jiobu and Marshall, 1977), husband's income (Mincer, 1963; Rindfuss and Sweet, 1977; Gurak, 1978), and family income (Bogue, 1969; Johnson, 1979). And, the relationship of income and fertility generally depends on which measure is used. For instance, it has generally been shown that women's income is negatively related to fertility (Cain and Weininger, 1973; Bean and Wood, 1974; Kritz and Gurak, 1976). Similarly, Jiobu and Marshall (1977) reported that the proportion of family income that is earned by women is negatively related to fertility among whites, Japanese Americans, Chinese Americans, and Filipino Americans. Studies (e.g., Johnson, 1979; Johnson and Nishida, 1980) have also shown that family income is negatively related to fertility. But, husband's income has been found to be positively related to fertility, after other variables have been controlled (Becker, 1960; Simon, 1974; Rindfuss and Sweet, 1977; DeFronzo, 1980). Nevertheless, others have found husband's income to be negatively (Ben-Porath, 1971) or curvilinearly (Willis, 1973) related to fertility. Moreover, occupational status has been demonstrated to be negatively related to fertility (Kritz and Gurak, 1976). For instance, Gurak (1978) noted that occupational status had a negative effect on fertility among five minority groups, particularly among Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans. Finally, employment status has been reported to be negatively related to fertility (Bogue, 1969;

Ritchey, 1975). For example, Johnson (1979) found that, after controlling for other variables, currently working women had fewer children than did nonworking women among blacks and whites.

Considerable attention has centered on immigrants' fertility (Coale, 1972; U.S. House of Representatives, 1978; Keely, 1979). Research on the fertility of immigrants has either examined the length of immigrants' residence in the receiving society (Falasco and Heer, 1984) or the generation (e.g., first generation, second generation) (Bean and Swicegood, 1982). Immigrants as a group have been found to have lower fertility than do natives (Uhlenberg, 1973; Keely, 1979). But, of course, there is much variation within the immigrant group. For instance, with the exception of Filipinos, Asian fertility has been relatively low (Massey, 1981). Among Hispanics, Cubans have the lowest fertility rate (Gurak, 1978), followed by those who come from South and Central America; Puerto Ricans and pariticularly Mexicans have the highest fertility levels (Massey, 1981). Although generational differences in fertility among Mexican Americans were not evident before 1970 (Uhlenberg, 1973), more recently fertility among the group has been shown to decrease across generations (Rindfuss and Sweet, 1977; Bean et al., 1984). For instance, Bean et al. (1980) discovered a pattern of intergenerational decline in fertility among Mexican Americans. In addition, Bean and Swicegood (1982) reported that current and cumulative fertility among Mexican Americans declined with exposure to U.S. society (measured by generation). Furthermore, Falasco and Heer (1984) revealed that length of residence in the U.S. had a negative effect on fertility among Mexican-origin women giving birth in Los Angeles County in 1980 and 1981.

Hence, the literature suggests that the majority of research on fertility among minority groups has primarily focused on intergroup differences, where white fertility is used as compare the fertility levels of minority groups. This approach, however, has generally failed to appreciate intragroup fertility variation among minority groups. In addition, it has been shown that a number of demographic, marital history, and socioeconomic variables are related to fertility. Thus, this paper seeks to examine fertility patterns within the Chicano group.

METHODS

Data were available from the 5% A Sample of the 1980 Public-Use Microdata Sample to examine fertility within the Chicano population. To reduce computational cost, one in five individuals were extracted from the 5% sample. Ever-married women of Mexican descent between the ages of 15 and 44 constitute the sample chosen for this investigation; 13,288 women are in the sample.

Women were then divided into four groups: Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. since 1970, Mexican-born women immigrating to the U.S. before 1970, U.S.-born women born in one of five southwestern states (e.g., Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas), U.S.-born women born outside of these states. Such a division goes one step beyond the usual comparison where generally only women living in one of the five southwestern states are examined. If, indeed, exposure to U.S. society has a negative impact on fertility, then we would expect Mexican-born women who first came to the U.S. since 1970 would have the highest fertility, while U.S.-born women would have the lowest; of course, we can also predict that U.S.-born women born outside of the five southwestern

states have lower fertility than their peers who were born in the southwest because the former, living among relatively fewer Chicanos, are more likely to be exposed to Anglo culture and its small-family norms than the latter. This latter comparison follows from research done among southern- and nonsouthern-born blacks (e.g., Ram, 1976).

Since the literature demonstrated that a number of demographic, marital history, and socioeconomic variables are related to fertility, several of these variables were selected for examination. First, age is divided into three categories (15-24 = 1; 25-34 = 2; 35-44 = 3), age at first marriage is divided into six groups (below 18 = 1; 18-19 = 2; 20-21 = 3; 22-23 = 4; 24-25 = 5; over 25 = 6), and marital disruption is divided into two categories (1=no; 2=yes (i.e., married more than once or married only once but divorced, separated, or widowed)). These three variables reflect the degree to which women have been "at risk" of childbearing. Women's education is measured by the highest number of years of education completed and is divided into five categories (less than 6 years = 1; 6-8 years = 2; 9-11 = 3; 12 = 4; over 12 = 5). Education is frequently used as a proxy for "tastes" concerning children and for knowledge of and effective use of contraceptives (Easterlin, 1969; Mason et al., 1971; Schultz, 1974); in addition, Jiobu and Marshall (1977) have pointed out that women's education reflects the ability to influence and implement family-size decisions. Family income in 1979 is divided into six groups ($7,499 or less = 1; $7,500-$12,499 = 2; $12,500-$17,499 = 3; $17,500-$22,499 = 4; $22,500-$29,999 = 5; $30,000 or more = 6). This variable reflects the degree to which families have economic resources. In addition, women's labor-force status in 1980 is divided into two categories (in labor force = 1; not in labor force = 2)

and the proportion of family income earned by women is divided into five groups (0% = 1; 1.0%-24.9% = 2; 25.0%-49.9% = 3; 50.0%-74.9% = 4; 75% or more = 5). The former variable reflects the degree of women's participation in the labor force, while the latter reflects the degree of importance that a woman's income represents to the family (Jiobu and Marshall, 1977).

Findings

Nearly 60% (57.6%) of the women in the sample were born in one of the five southwest states (Table 1). In addition, about 9% were born elsewhere in the U.S. Approximately one-third (33.7%) were born in Mexico, with the majority of these first immigrating to the U.S. in the last decade. Women born in Mexico and first coming to the U.S. before 1970 are the oldest (mean age, 33.4) among the four subgroups. Women born in the U.S. have an average age of 30, while those born in Mexico and immigrating to the U.S. in the last decade are the youngest. In addition, U.S.-born women tend to marry at an earlier age than do their Mexican-born peers. A similar pattern is evident among the group with regard to four variables (percent marital disruption, median years of education, percent in the labor force, mean percent of family income earned by woman). Indeed, native-born Chicanas tend to have higher rates of marital disruption, are more likely to be in the labor force, have a higher level of education, and their income represents a higher percentage of the total family income. Mexican-born women coming to the U.S. since 1970 have the lowest levels on these variables, followed by their counterparts who immigrated to the U.S. before 1970 and southwest-born Chicanas. And, Mexican-born women first arriving in the

U.S. before 1970 and U.S.-born Chicanas have a median family income of about $16,000, while those coming to the U.S. in the last decade have the lowest family income ($12,500). Finally, Mexican-born women immigrating to the U.S. before 1970 have the highest mean number of children ever born (3.0), while native Chicanas born outside the southwest have the fewest (2.2). Hence, it is evident that the four subgroups differ, particularly with regard to socioeconomic characteristics.

Mexican-born women immigrating to the U.S. before 1970 have the highest fertility level, while U.S.-born Chicanas have fewer children than the overall mean (Table 2). When demographic and marital history variables are controlled for, however, the most recent immigrants to the U.S. have the highest number of children, while those arriving here before 1970 also have a higher rate than the overall mean; in contrast, U.S.-born Chicanas have a lower number of children, particularly those born outside the southwest. But the differences between the groups practically disappear when demographic, marital history, and socioeconomic variables are taken into account. Mexican-born women coming into the U.S. since 1970 and native-born Chicanas born outside of the southwest have fertility rates below the overall mean, while the other two groups of women exhibit rates slightly above the mean.

Differences are evident between the four groups with regard to the relationships between the independent variables and fertility. Age and education are most strongly related to the number of children ever born (Table 3). In addition, age at first marriage generally exhibits an influence on fertility; among native-born Chicanas born outside of the southwest, a curvilinear relationship is observed. Moreover, the proportion of family income that is earned by women is related to

fertility in all the groups except the Mexican-born group arriving in the U.S. since 1970. Curiously, marital disruption tends to result in a higher number of children in every group.

These variables are next examined in a multivariate framework. The seven independent variables account for over 40% of the variance in fertility among the following groups: total women, Mexican-born women who immigrated to the U.S. in the last decade, and southwest-born Chicanas (Table 4). Three independent variables (age, age at first marriage, education) are the most important predictors of fertility in each group. Age clearly demonstrates the most influence on the number of children ever born to these women. In addition, women in each age group who married at younger ages tend to have higher fertility levels than those who married at a later age. Moreover, increasing education tends to lower women's fertility. With only one exception, these independent variables are linearly related to fertility. Only native-born Chicanas born outside of the southwest who married over the age of 25 deviate from the established pattern; these women, comparatively speaking, have a fertility rate that is closer to their group mean than do women of the three other groups who married at the same age. Also, while fertility rates drop below the group mean with approximately nine years of education among Mexican-born women, this drop occurs at a higher educational level among U.S.-born Chicanas.

The remaining four independent variables are not as strongly related to fertility; moreover, less consistency occurs between the groups with regard to the relationships between these variables and fertility. For instance, the proportion of family income that is earned by women is significantly related to fertility among the subgroups other than

Mexican-born women who have been in the U.S. the longest. Mexican-born women who first arrived in the U.S. in the last ten years and southwest-born Chicanas generally exhibit a negatively linear relationship between this proportion and fertility. Native-born Chicanas born outside of the five southwest states, however, display a different pattern between these variables, where the lowest fertility results among women whose earnings represent one-fourth to less than one-half or at least three-fourths of the family's income. But, family income is only significantly associated with fertility among southwest-born Chicanas. With few exceptions, this relationship tends to be a linear one; Chicanas whose families have higher incomes tend to have fewer children than those having lower income levels. Mexican-born women coming to the U.S. before 1970 exhibit a curvilinear relationship; indeed, women with family incomes less than $7,500 and those with the two highest income levels tend to have the fewest number of children among women in this group. In addition, marital disruption negatively affects fertility only among Mexican-born women. Finally, labor-force participation is significantly related to the number of children ever born among Mexican-born women who first arrived in the U.S. before 1970 and southwest-born Chicanas.

CONCLUSION

Most research on fertility compares minority with majority groups. Such an approach, however, fails to examine the potential diversity of fertility levels within minority populations.

The results of this examination demonstrate, however, that few differences exist between four subgroups of Chicana women, after controlling for demographic, marital history, and socioeconomic

variables. Nevertheless, the most recently arriving group of Mexican-born women and U.S.-born Chicanas born outside of the southwest tend to have fewer children, while Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. before 1970 generally have more children. Age, age at first marriage, and education are most strongly related to fertility in each group, with the first positively related and the last two negatively related to fertility. The remaining four marital history and socioeconomic variables are not as strongly related to fertility.

Fertility-pattern differences can be seen between the four subgroups with regard to the relationships between these independent variables and fertility, however. For instance, marital disruption is significantly related to fertility only among the two Mexican-born groups. In addition, labor-force participation is significantly related to fertility among Mexican-born women first coming to the U.S. before 1970 and southwest-born Chicanas. Moreover, family income is significantly related to fertility only among Chicanas born in the southwest. Finally, the percentage of a family's inmcome that is earned by the woman is significantly related to fertility in each group, except the most recently arriving group of Mexican-born women.

The approach used to separate different segments of the Chicano population has implications for those examining this population. Garcia and Maldonado (1982) have demonstrated the methodological and inferential problems that arise when policymakers and researchers use Spanish-origin statistics to represent Chicanos; they also noted that similar problems result when the Chicano population is not further disaggregated by nativity and generational status. Garcia and Maldonado (1982) pointed

out that the use of Spanish-origin statistics as a surrogate for that of Chicanos has yielded misleading positive socioeconomic changes that have yet to occur among Chicanos. They also found employment-related differences between native- and Mexican-born Chicanos which in some instances were greater than those observed between Chicanos and non-Chicano Hispanics. Therefore, a disaggregating approach is necessary to effectively understand the Chicano population.

Further research using such an approach is needed in examining other ethnic groups, particularly those that have substantial proportions of recent immigrants (e.g., Cubans, Puerto Ricans, Vietnamese). In addition, a study concerning fertility patterns of Chicanas who have completed the usual childbearing years (e.g., 45 years and older) can examine the degree of diversity in fertility experiences among subgroups of this population; such findings may reveal information regarding fertility trends among different segments of Chicanas. Furthermore, the disaggregation technique may also prove beneficial in examining Chicana and Chicano subgroups with regard to their attitudes toward the use of contraceptives.

Finally, several shortcomings concerning this analysis should be pointed out. First, the year (1970) used in dividing the Mexican-born women was selected arbitrarily. One problem that can arise from this is that older women who first immigrated to the U.S. before 1970 could have spent more years in the U.S. than younger women first coming to this country after 1970, although the latter may have spent a greater proportion of their lives in the U.S. Consequently, a theoretical cutoff point is needed. Second, the place-of-birth category used to divide U.S.-born Chicanas ignores the length of time that people have spent in

the area where they were born. This problem may be especially accute among the farmworker population, which generally resides in the southwest throughout the year but migrate out of the region for several months to work. In such cases, children born outside the southwest would be included in this place-of-birth category, although they live in the southwest for most of the year (and more than likely exhibit socioeconomic characteristics closer to their peers born in the southwest). Perhaps current residence could have been used more accurately as a disaggregating variable. However, in this study we were interested in seperating Mexican- and native-born Chicanas. Dividing the population by current residence would have neglected place of birth, and the incorporation of current residence and place of birth would have complicated the situation. Indeed, this incorporation would have resulted in eight subgroups, and small numbers within some of these subgroups would have prevented thorough analysis. Furthermore, examination of the data reveals that approximately one-fourth (24.7%) of Chicanas between the ages of 15 and 44 who were born in a non-southwestern U.S. state made their home in the southwest in 1980; in contrast, 91.0% of those born in the southwest were found living in this region in 1980.

REFERENCES

Bean, Frank D., Ruth M. Cullen, Elizabeth H. Stephen, and C. Gray Swicegood
1984 "Generational differences in fertility among Mexican Americans: implications for assessing the effects of immigration." Social Science Quarterly 65:573-582.

Bean, Frank D., and Gray Swicegood
1982 "Generation, female education and Mexican American fertility." Social Science Quarterly 63:131-144.

Bean, Frank D., Gray Swicegood, and Thomas F. Linsley
1980 "Patterns of fertility variation among Mexican immigrants to the United States." Texas Population Research Center Paper No. 2.015. The University of Texas at Austin.

Bean, Frank D., and Charles H. Wood
1974 "Ethnic variations in the relationship between income and fertility." Demography 11:629-656.

Becker, Gary S.
1960 "An economic analysis of fertility." Pp. 209-240 in Universities-National Bureau Committee for Economic Research (ed.), Demographic and Economic Change in Developed Countries. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.

Ben-Porath, Yorham
1971 Fertility and Economic Activity in the Short Run, Israel, 1951-1969. Jerusalem: Hebrew University. Mimeograph.

Bogue, Donald J.
1969 Principles of Demography. New York: Wiley.

Bradshaw, Benjamin, and Frank D. Bean
1972 "Some aspects of the fertility of Mexican-Americans." Pp. 139-164 in Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, C. F. Westoff and R. Parke, Jr. (eds.), Demographic and Social Aspects of Population Growth. Washington (DC): Government Printing Office.

Browning, Harley L.
1974 "The reproductive behavior of minority groups in the U.S.A." Pp. 299-317 in W. Montagna and W. A. Sadler (eds.), Reproductive Behavior. New York: Plenum Press.

Bumpass, Larry
1969 "Age at marriage as a variable in socioeconomic differentials in fertility." Demography 6:45-54.

Burma, John H.
1970 Mexican Americans in the United States. Cambridge (MA): Schenkman Publishing Co.

Cain, Glenn G., and Adriana Weininger
1973 "Economic determinants of fertility: results from cross-sectional aggregate data." Demography 10:205-223.

Cho, Lee-Jay, Wilson H. Grabill, and Donald J. Bogue
1970 Differential Current Fertility in the United States. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Coale, Ansley J.
1972 "Alternative paths to a stationary population." Pp. 589-603 in Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, C. F. Westoff and R. Parke, Jr. (eds.), Demographic and Social Aspects of Population Growth. Washington (DC): Government Printing Office.

DeFronzo, James
1980 "Female labor force participation in 48 states: cross-sectional and change analysis for the 1960-70 decade." Sociology and Social Research 64:263-278.

Easterlin, Richard J.
1969 "Towards a socioeconomic theory of fertility: a survey of recent research on economic factors in American fertility." Pp. 127-156 in R. E. Behrman and L. Corsa, Jr. (eds.), Fertility and Family Planning: A World View. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Falasco, Dee, and David M. Heer
1984 "Economic and fertility differences between legal and undocumented migrant Mexican families: possible effects of immigration policy changes." Social Science Quarterly 65:495-504.

Frisbie, W. Parker, and Frank D. Bean
1978 "Some issues in the demographic study of racial and ethnic populations." Pp. 1-14 in W. P. Parkers and F. D. Bean (eds.), The Demography of Racial and Ethnic Groups. New York: Academic Press.

Garcia, Philip, and Lionel A. Maldonado
1982 "America's Mexicans: a plea for specificity." The Social Science Journal 19:9-24.

Gastil, Raymond D.
1971 "Homicide and a regional culture of violence." American Sociological Review 63:412-427.

Goldscheider, Calvin, and Peter R. Uhlenberg
1969 "Minority group status and fertility." American Journal of Sociology 74:361-373.

Gordon, Milton M.
1964 Assimilation in American Life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grebler, Leo, Joan W. Moore, and Ralph C. Guzman
1970 The Mexican American People. New York: Free Press.

Gurak, Douglas T.
1978 "Sources of ethnic fertility differences: an examination of five minority groups." Social Science Quarterly 59:295-310.

Jiobu, R., and H. Marshall
1977 "Minority status and family size: a comparison of explanations." Population Studies 31:509-517.

Johnson, Nan E.
1979 "Minority-group status and the fertility of black Americans, 1970: a new look." American Journal of Sociology 84:1386-1400.

Johnson, Nan E., and Ryoko Nishida
1980 "Minority-group status and fertility: a study of Japanese and Chinese in Hawaii and California." American Journal of Sociology 86:496-511.

Keely, C. B.
1979 U.S. Immigration: A Policy Analysis. New York: Population Council.

Kennedy, Robert E., Jr.
1973 "Minority group status and fertility: the Irish." American Sociological Review 38:85-96.

Kritz, Mary M., and Douglas T. Gurak
1976 "Ethnicity and fertility in the U.S.: an analysis of 1970 Public Use Sample Data" Review of Public Data Use 4:12-23.

Lee, Eun Sul, and Robert E. Roberts
1981 "Ethnic fertility differentials in the Southwest: the case of Mexican Americans reexamined." Sociology and Social Research 65:194-210.

Lee, Everett, and Anne Lee
1959 "The future fertility of the American Negro." Social Forces 37:228-231.

Loftin, Colin, and Robert H. Hill
1974 "Regional subculture and homicide: an examination of the Gastill-Hackney Thesis." American Sociological Review 39:714-724.

Lopez, David E., and Georges Sabagh
1978 "Untangling structural and normative aspects of the minority status-fertility hypothesis." American Journal of Sociology 83:1491-1497.

Mason, Karen Oppenheimer, Abraham S. David, Eva K. Gerstel, Quentin W. Lindsey, and Michael V. E. Rulisan
1971 Social and Economic Correlates of Family Fertility. Research Triangle Park (NC): Research Triangle Institute.

Massey, Douglas S.
1981 "Dimensions of the new immigration to the United States and the prospects for assimilation." Annual Review of Sociology 7:57-85.

Mincer, Jacob
1963 "Market prices, opportunity costs, and income effects." Pp. 67-82 in C. Christ (ed.), Measurement in Economics and Econometrics in Memory of Yehuda Gruenfeld. Stanford (CA): Stanford University Press.

Petersen, William
1969 Population. New York: The MacMillan Co.

Ram, Bali
1976 "Regional-sub-cultural explanations of black fertility in the United States." Population Studies 30:553-559.

Rindfuss, Ronald R., and James A. Sweet
1977 Postwar Fertility Trends and Differentials in the United States. New York: Academic Press.

Ritchey, P. Neal
1975 "The effect of minority group status on fertility: a re-examination of concepts." Population Studies 29:249-257.

Roberts, Robert E., and Eun Sul Lee
1974 "Minority group status and fertility revisited." American Journal of Sociology 80:503-523.

Schultz, T. Paul
1974 Fertility Determinants: A Theory, Evidence and Application to Policy Evaluation. Santa Monica (CA): Rand Corporation.

Simon, Julian L.
1974 The Effects of Income on Fertility. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, Carolina Population Center.

Sweet, James A., and Sarah Betsy Cohen
1974 "The impact of marital disruption and remarriage on fertility." Journal of Marriage and the Family 36:87-96.

Teller, Charles H., Leobardo F. Estrada, Jose Hernandez, and David Alvirez
1977 Cuantos Somos: A Demographic Study of the Mexican American Population. Austin: The University of Texas Center for Mexican American Studies.

U.S. House of Representatives
1978 Legal and Illegal Immigration to the United States: Report by the Select Committee on Population. Washington (DC): Government Printing Office.

Uhlenberg, Peter
1973 "Fertility patterns within the Mexican-American population." Social Biology 20:30-39.

Willis, Robert J.
1973 "A new approach to the economic theory of fertility behavior." Journal of Political Economy 81:14-64.

Table 1. Summary statistics of independent and dependent variables by place-of-birth of Chicanas.

Variables	Total	Born in Mexico: Immigrated Since 1970	Born in Mexico: Immigrated Before 1970	Born in U.S.: Born in Southwest	Born in U.S.: Born Outside Southwest
Mean Age	30.1	28.5	33.4	30.0	29.7
Mean Age at 1st Marriage	20.1	20.5	21.1	19.7	19.8
Pct. Marital Disruption	22.8%	11.5%	18.3%	25.9%	35.2%
Mean Yrs. of Education	9.7	6.7	8.4	10.8	11.1
Pct. in Labor Force	53.6%	43.0%	50.1%	56.9%	61.7%
Mean pct. of family income earned by women	20.7%	14.7%	19.2%	22.4%	25.7%
Median family income	$15,335	$12,490	$16,360	$16,310	$16,005
Mean number of children ever born	2.5	2.6	3.0	2.4	2.2
N	13,288	2,622	1,860	7,654	1,152

Table 2. Unadjusted and adjusted deviations from the total mean number of children ever born for four Chicana subgroups.

Subgroup	N	Unadjusted Deviation	Control[1] 1	Control[1] 2	Adjusted Mean Number of Children Ever Born
Grand Mean 2.49					
Mexican-born immigrated since 1970	2,612[2]	0.11	0.37	-0.03	2.46
Mexican-born immigrated before 1970	1,857	0.52	0.21	0.07	2.56
U.S.-born (southwest)	7,632	-0.12	-0.14	0.01	2.50
U.S.-born (outside southwest)	1,151	-0.31	-0.28	-0.08	2.41

[1]Control 1 refers to adjusted deviation after controlling for age, age at first marriage, and marital disruption; control 2 refers to adjusted deviation after controlling for age, age at first marriage, labor force participation, education, family income, and percentage of family income earned by women.
[2]Missing cases were excluded from the analysis.

Table 3. Multiple classification analysis summary statistics for the bivariate relationships between selected independent variables and fertility for four Chicana subgroups.[1]

Independent Variables and Categories	Chicana Group[2] 1 Un-Adj. Dev.[3]	1 Eta	2 Un-Adj. Dev.	2 Eta	3 Un-Adj. Dev.	3 Eta	4 Un-Adj. Dev.	4 Eta	5 Un-Adj. Dev.	5 Eta
Grand Mean		2.49		2.61		3.01		2.37		2.18
Age:		0.49		0.53		0.43		0.50		0.46
15-24	-1.29		-1.32		-1.80		-1.20		-1.03	
25-34	-0.15		0.04		-0.45		-0.15		-0.11	
35-44	1.34		1.90		0.87		1.33		1.21	
Age at first marriage:		0.19		0.21		0.28		0.19		0.15
17 or younger	0.60		0.69		1.13		0.55		0.33	
18-19	-0.03		0.05		-0.01		-0.02		-0.04	
20-21	-0.23		-0.34		-0.12		-0.22		-0.23	
22-23	-0.33		-0.36		-0.34		-0.37		-0.30	
24-25	-0.42		-0.56		-0.37		-0.45		-0.47	
26 or older	-0.30		-0.31		-0.67		-0.39		0.37	
Marital disruption:		0.05		0.05		0.02		0.08		0.11
No	-0.06		-0.04		-0.02		-0.09		-0.15	
Yes	0.19		0.29		0.07		0.26		0.27	
Labor force participation:		0.13		0.02		0.18		0.16		0.12
No	0.27		-0.04		0.38		0.34		0.28	
Yes	-0.23		0.05		-0.38		-0.26		-0.18	

Table 3 continued.

Independent Variables and Categories	Chicana Group[2] 1 Un-Adj. Dev.[3]	1 Eta	2 Un-Adj. Dev.	2 Eta	3 Un-Adj. Dev.	3 Eta	4 Un-Adj. Dev.	4 Eta	5 Un-Adj. Dev.	5 Eta
Education:		0.34		0.30		0.37		0.36		0.28
5 years or less	1.28		0.83		1.21		1.70		1.32	
6-8	0.52		-0.17		0.29		0.99		0.94	
9-11	-0.04		-0.67		-0.40		0.16		0.18	
12	-0.48		-0.85		-0.78		-0.36		-0.19	
13 years or more	-0.83		-0.88		-0.96		-0.76		-0.69	
Family income:		0.04		0.06		0.07		0.05		0.09
$7,499 or less	0.08		-0.06		-0.05		0.15		0.28	
$7,500-$12,499	0.06		0.12		0.14		0.00		-0.02	
$12,500-$17,499	0.00		-0.07		0.15		-0.01		-0.10	
$17,500-$22,499	0.03		0.10		0.07		0.01		-0.02	
$22,500-$29,999	-0.14		0.03		-0.27		-0.11		-0.22	
$30,000 or more	-0.13		-0.37		-0.10		-0.09		-0.04	
Pct. of family income earned by women:		0.16		0.04		0.20		0.19		0.20
0%	0.34		0.03		0.40		0.43		0.42	
0.01%-24.99%	-0.04		0.02		0.01		-0.04		-0.05	
25.00%-49.99%	-0.32		0.02		-0.49		-0.33		-0.53	
50.00%-74.99%	-0.48		-0.21		-0.64		-0.51		-0.22	
75.00% or more	-0.42		-0.28		-0.63		-0.42		-0.02	

[1]Missing cases were excluded from the analysis. Because of space limitation, the N for each category of each subgroup is not shown.

[2]For Chicana groups: (1 = all women; 2 = Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. since 1970; 3 = Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. before 1970; 4 = U.S.-born Chicanas born in one of five southwest states; 5 = U.S.-born Chicanas born outside of the southwest).

[3]Un-Adj. Dev. refers to the unadjusted deviations from the respective group mean.

Table 4. Multiple classification analysis summary statistics for the regression of fertility on the independent variables for four Chicana subgroups.[1]

Independent Variables and Categories	Chicana Group[2] 1 Adj. Dev.[3]	1 Beta	2 Adj. Dev.	2 Beta	3 Adj. Dev.	3 Beta	4 Adj. Dev.	4 Beta	5 Adj. Dev.	5 Beta
Grand Mean		2.49		2.61		3.01		2.37		2.18
Age:		0.56*		0.65*		0.47*		0.55*		0.49*
15-24	-1.60		-1.77		-2.07		-1.46		-1.20	
25-34	-0.04		0.21		-0.42		-0.03		-0.03	
35-44	1.43		2.16		0.91		1.37		1.24	
Age at first marriage:		0.29*		0.38*		0.36*		0.25*		0.16*
17 or younger	0.68		0.96		1.13		0.54		0.29	
18-19	0.23		0.43		0.41		0.17		0.10	
20-21	-0.10		-0.06		-0.01		-0.12		-0.04	
22-23	-0.42		-0.53		-0.39		-0.40		-0.31	
24-25	-0.80		-1.01		-0.64		-0.75		-0.74	
26 or older	-1.16		-1.47		-1.25		-1.09		-0.33	
Marital disruption:		0.02*		0.07*		0.06*		0.00		0.02
No	0.02		0.05		0.06		0.00		-0.03	
Yes	-0.08		-0.40		-0.28		-0.01		0.06	
Labor force participation:		0.05*		0.02		0.09*		0.07*		0.05
No	0.11		-0.03		0.18		0.14		0.11	
Yes	-0.09		0.04		-0.18		-0.11		-0.07	

Table 4 continued.

Independent Variables and Categories	Chicana Group[2] 1 Adj. Dev.[3]	1 Beta	2 Adj. Dev.	2 Beta	3 Adj. Dev.	3 Beta	4 Adj. Dev.	4 Beta	5 Adj. Dev.	5 Beta
Education:		0.21*		0.15*		0.20*		0.20*		0.17*
5 years or less	0.82		0.43		0.71		0.94		0.65	
6-8	0.30		-0.11		0.07		0.57		0.50	
9-11	-0.03		-0.26		-0.20		0.09		0.18	
12	-0.30		-0.46		-0.37		-0.20		-0.12	
13 years or more	-0.49		-0.47		-0.53		-0.43		-0.44	
Family income:		0.05*		0.03		0.06		0.06*		0.07
$7,499 or less	0.08		0.01		-0.11		0.12		0.16	
$7,500-$12,499	0.05		0.03		0.05		0.04		-0.05	
$12,500-$17,499	0.07		-0.01		0.12		0.08		0.07	
$17,500-$22,499	0.04		0.02		0.14		0.02		0.04	
$22,500-$29,999	-0.13		0.00		-0.17		-0.13		-0.17	
$30,000 or more	-0.20		-0.21		-0.07		-0.19		-0.13	
Pct. of family income earned by women:		0.08*		0.07*		0.06		0.09*		0.12*
0%	0.12		0.11		0.12		0.13		0.19	
0.01%-24.99%	0.06		-0.01		-0.01		0.07		0.13	
25.00%-49.99%	-0.11		-0.14		-0.15		-0.08		-0.27	
50.00%-74.99%	-0.18		-0.39		-0.12		-0.17		0.00	
75.00% or more	-0.39		-0.33		-0.23		-0.43		-0.30	
Multiple R^2		0.410		0.449		0.396		0.417		0.317

[1]Missing cases were excluded from the analysis. Because of space limitation, the N of each category for each subgroup is not shown.

[2]For Chicana group: (1 = all women; 2 = Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. since 1970; 3 = Mexican-born women first immigrating to the U.S. before 1970; 4 = U.S.-born Chicanas born in one of five southwest states; 5 = U.S.-born Chicanas born outside of the southwest).

[3]Adj. Dev. refers to the adjusted deviations from the respective group mean.

*Indicates that the beta coefficient is statistically significant at the 0.05 level or beyond.